



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON, DC

JUL 1 1998

Office of the Assistant Secretary

AFBCMR 97-03138

MEMORANDUM FOR THE CHIEF OF STAFF

Having received and considered the recommendation of the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records and under the authority of Section 1552, Title 10, United States Code (70A Stat 116), it is directed that:

The pertinent military records of the Department of the Air Force relating to [REDACTED] to include the Aerial Achievement Medal for the period 3 June 1993 through 5 September 1995, be considered for promotion to the grade of major by Special Selection Board for the Calendar Year 1997C Central Major Selection Board.


JOE G. LINEBERGER
Director
Air Force Review Boards Agency

JUL 1 1998

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: 97-03138

COUNSEL: None

HEARING DESIRED: No

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

His record, to include the Aerial Achievement Medal (AAM) for the period 3 June 1993 through 5 September 1995, be considered for promotion to the grade of major by Special Selection Board (SSB) for the Calendar Year 1997C (CY97C) Central Major Selection Board.

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

The Aerial Achievement Medal decoration was processed too late by his previous unit and was not in his records to be considered by the CY97C selection board.

In support of the appeal, applicant submits a mission tracking log, e-mail, officer selection brief, and AAM Special Order and documentation.

Applicant's complete submission is attached at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant is currently serving on extended active duty in the grade of captain.

Applicant was considered and not selected for promotion to the grade of major by the CY97C Selection Board.

Applicant was awarded the Aerial Achievement Medal for the period 3 June 1993 through 5 September 1995 by Special Order [REDACTED] dated 19 September 1997. By regulation this decoration was not required to be in his officer selection record (OSR) when it met the CY97C board.

OPR profile since 1992, follows:

	<u>PERIOD ENDING</u>	<u>EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL</u>
	15 May 92	Meets Standards
	02 Sep 93	Meets Standards
	09 Jan 95	Meets Standards
	01 Oct 95	Meets Standards
#	01 Oct 96	Meets Standards
	12 Jun 97	Meets Standards

Top report at time of **CY97C** board.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

The Chief, Appeals and SSB Branch, AFPC/DPPPA, reviewed the application and states that the applicant's contention that the AAM should have been considered by the **CY97C** board held 16 June 1997 is unfounded. By regulation, a decoration is required to be placed into official channels within two years from the year of the service which it is recognizing, and awarded within three years. Once the special order is accomplished, a decoration is to be placed in the OSR within 60 days. Until a special order is cut, a decoration does not exist. The applicant's period of service for the AAM ended on 5 September 1995. His decoration was required to be completed and awarded by September 1998. The special order is dated 19 September 1997, well within regulatory requirements. However, the decoration did not exist when the **CY97C** board convened 16 June 1997. While the applicant contends he faxed the Decor 6 during the summer of 1996, they note it is dated 15 February 1997. How could the applicant fax a computer product that had not yet been extracted from the personnel data system (PDS)? The applicant provided no evidence, other than his personal recollection of events during the period, to substantiate the award was delayed. It appears the first correspondence between the approval authority and the applicant occurred in August 1997, some two months after the board was held in June 1997. After reviewing those e-mail excerpts, they conclude the approval authority did everything in their power to expedite the award and subsequently accomplished it in direct accordance with applicable regulations. They strongly recommend denying the applicant's request to include the AAM in his record for the **CY97C** board. It would be unfair to other officers nonselected by the **CY97C** board, who also had decorations not included in their OSRs due to a special order being written shortly before or after the board, to include the AAM in the applicant's SSB consideration. They strongly recommend denying the applicant's request for SSB consideration on this issue.

A complete copy of the Air Force evaluation is attached at Exhibit C.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

The applicant reviewed the Air Force evaluation and states that he apparently left an impression that the AFBCMR needs more corroboration which he is happy to provide. Therefore, he has attached a letter from the squadron commander during the "delay" period of 1995 - 1997, the individual whom he feels is the most credible and knowledgeable overall authority on this matter.

In addition, applicant submits a statement from the squadron commander stating when he assumed command of the [REDACTED] Airlift Squadron (AS) at Ramstein AB in August 1995, they had been literally facing a backlog of two years worth of aeronautical decorations. The decoration processes at Ramstein - base/wing personnel channels as well as USAFE - were often quite an obstacle. It took time to bring about institutional changes within the [REDACTED] AS and help repair these broken processes outside the squadron. They were forced to submit flying decorations only in bulk - often making their own people wait great lengths to be formally recognized for such achievements. The applicant was one of those affected despite his commendable efforts through all channels.

Applicant's complete response, with attachment, is attached at Exhibit E.

THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

1. The applicant has exhausted all remedies provided by existing law or regulations.
2. The application was timely filed.
3. Sufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of probable error or injustice. After reviewing the evidence of record, we note the applicant's diligent attempts to have the award placed in his record prior to the convening of the board. We also note the statement provided by the squadron commander stating that when he assumed command of the 37th Airlift Squadron in August 1995, there was a two-year backlog of aeronautical decorations and that they were forced to submit flying decorations only in bulk - often making their own people wait great lengths to be formally recognized for such achievements. While the delay was not in violation of the applicable regulation, we believe that had it not been for the two-year backlog of awards the squadron had to deal with, the AAM would have been awarded sooner and placed in his record prior to the convening of the CY97C selection board. In view of the

foregoing and in an effort to remove any possibility of an injustice to the applicant, we recommend that his record, to include the AAM for the period 3 June 1993 through 5 September 1995, be considered for promotion to the grade of major by a Special Selection Board for the CY97C Selection Board.

THE BOARD RECOMMENDS THAT:

The pertinent military records of the Department of the Air Force relating to APPLICANT, to include the Aerial Achievement Medal for the period 3 June 1993 through 5 September 1995, be considered for promotion to the grade of major by Special Selection Board for the Calendar Year 1997C Central Major Selection Board.

The following members of the Board considered this application in Executive Session on 14 May 1998, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Ms. Charlene M. Bradley, Panel Chair
 Mr. Terry A. Yonkers, Member
 Dr. Gerald B. Kauvar, Member
 Ms. Gloria J. Williams, Examiner (without vote)

All members voted to correct the records, as recommended. The following documentary evidence was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 20 Oct 97, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, AFPC/DPPPA, dated 12 Nov 97.
- Exhibit D. Letter, AFBCMR, dated 24 Nov 97.
- Exhibit E. Applicant's Response, dated 31 Jan 98, w/atch.

Charlene M. Bradley
 CHARLENE M. BRADLEY
 Panel Chair



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE PERSONNEL CENTER
RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE TEXAS



12 NOV 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR AFBCMR

FROM: HQ AFPC/DPPPA
550 C Street West, Suite 8
Randolph AFB TX 78150-4710

SUBJECT: [REDACTED]

Requested Action. Applicant requests special selection board (SSB) consideration for the CY97C (16 Jun 97) (P0497C) central major selection board with the Aerial Achievement Medal (AAM), inclusive period 3 Jun 93 - 5 Sep 95, included in his officer selection record (OSR).

Basis for Request. Applicant contends the AAM should have been considered by the P0497C promotion board.

Recommendation. Deny,

Facts and 1

a. Application is timely. Application under AFI 36-2401, Correcting Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Reports, would not be appropriate in this instance. Applicant has one nonselection for promotion to the grade of major by the P0497C central major promotion board.

b. AFI 36-2803, The Awards and Decorations Program, 15 Aug 94 is the governing directive.

c. In support of his appeal, the applicant submits a personal brief, excerpts from mission tracking log, email correspondence between the applicant and unit awarding the decoration dated between 4 Aug 97 and 12 Sep 97, copy of Officer Selection Brief (OSB), copy of orders, citation, Decor 6, and AAM.

d. The applicant's contention the AAM should have been considered by the P0497C board held 16 Jun 97 is unfounded. By regulation, a decoration is required to be placed into official channels within two years from the end of the service which it is recognizing, and awarded within three years. Once the special order is accomplished, a decoration is to be placed in the OSR within 60 days (AFI 36-2803, Fig 3-1, Note 4). Until a special order is cut, a decoration does not exist. The applicant's period of service for the AAM ended on 5 Sep 95. His decoration was required to be completed and awarded by Sep 1998. It was special ordered 19 Sep 97, well within regulatory requirements. However, the decoration did not exist when the P0497C board convened 16 Jun 97. While the applicant contends he faxed the Decor 6 during

9703138

the summer of 1996, we note it is dated 15 Feb 97. How could the applicant fax a computer product that had not yet been extracted from the personnel data system (PDS)? The applicant provided no evidence, other than his personal recollection of events during the period, to substantiate the award was delayed. It appears the first correspondence between the approval authority and the applicant occurred in Aug 97, some two months after the board was held in Jun 97. After reviewing those e-mail excerpts, we conclude the approval authority did everything in their power to expedite the award and subsequently accomplished it in direct accordance with applicable regulations. We strongly recommend denying the applicant's request to include the AAM in his record for the P0497C board. It would be unfair to other officers nonselected by the P0497C board, who also had decorations not included in their OSRs due to a special order being written shortly before or after the board, to include the AAM in the applicant's SSB consideration,

e. Each eligible officer considered by the P0497C board received detailed instructions for review of their preselection briefs and associated records. The instructions clearly state "Officers are responsible for reviewing their PRF, OPRs and data on their preselection brief for accuracy prior to the board date, addressing all concerns and discrepancies through their servicing Military Personnel Flight (MPF), and if necessary, their chain of command and senior rater. Officers will not be considered by SSB if, in exercising reasonable diligence, the officer should have discovered an error or omission in his/her records and could have taken timely corrective action." It was his responsibility to notify the board of the omission of the AAM by letter if he believed it important to his promotion consideration. However, we do not find any record the applicant wrote such a letter to the board president. We strongly recommend denying the applicant's request for SSB consideration on this issue

Summary. Based on the evidence provided, our recommendation of denial


MARIANNE STERLING, Lt Col, USAF
Chief, Appeals and SSB Branch
Directorate of Personnel Program Mgt

9703138